



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,538	10/31/2005	Yongzhi Xi	272331US0PCT	7166
22850	7590	05/30/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			LONG, SCOTT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/534,538	XI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott D. Long	1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/19/2008 has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 1-11 and 20 are canceled. Claim 21 is amended. Claims 12-19 and 21 are under current examination.

Priority

This application claims benefit as a 371 of PCT/CN03/00967 (filed 11/14/2003). This application claims benefit from foreign patent application (CHINA) 02149375.8 (filed 11/14/2002). The instant application has been granted the benefit date, 14 November 2003, from the application PCT/CN03/00967.

Response to Arguments - Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112

Response to Arguments – 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Applicant's arguments (Remarks, page 4) and claim amendments, filed 19 February 2008, with respect to claim 21 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Claim 21 has been amended to recite "the protein of SEQ ID NO:3." Therefore, the rejection of claim 21 is moot. Accordingly, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claim 21 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Response to Arguments – New Matter (35 USC 112, first paragraph)

Applicant's arguments (Remarks, page 4) and claim amendments, filed 19 February 2008, with respect to claim 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Claim 20 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 20 is moot. Accordingly, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph (written description/new matter).

Response to Arguments - Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102/103

Applicant's arguments (Remarks, page 4) and claim amendments, filed 19 February 2008, with respect to claim 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Claim 20 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 20 is moot. Accordingly, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claim 20 under 35 USC 102/103 as anticipated by or obvious over Xi et al. (accession number AAK98621, direct submission on 19 July 2001).

Response to Arguments - Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 12-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upholt et al. (PNAS. April 1986; Vol.83: 2325-2329) in view of Matsumoto et al (US-6,010,722, issued 4 January 2000).

Applicant's arguments (Remarks, pages 4-5) and claim amendments, filed 19 February 2008, with respect to claims 12-19 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

The applicant traverses the rejection of claims 12-19 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Upholt in view of Matsumoto. The applicant asserts that the chicken collagen II gene described by Upholt are not identical to the present claim embodiments. The applicant presents BLAST results showing minor differences between the GenBank sequence submitted by Upholt in 1986 and the sequence submitted by the applicant in PCT/CN03/00967 (filed 11/14/2003). The examiner acknowledges that there are minor differences between the two sequences, particularly where repetitive stretches of A's or T's predominate. In addition, Upholt describe in their Materials and Methods section (page 2325, col.2) that both strands were not sequenced and that only 99% of the mRNA encoding sequence was sequenced. Because Upholt

has clearly identified their nucleic acid as chicken type II procollagen gene and while not identical, it is almost identical to the claimed genomic and cDNA sequences, and given the advances in sequencing during the intervening 17 years, the examiner believes the sequences of Upholt are obvious over the claimed sequences. The sequences claimed by the applicant are not different alleles of chicken type II collagen, rather they are only more accurate versions of sequences first identified by Upholt. Therefore, the examiner believes that the teachings of Upholt and Matsumoto are obvious over claims 12-19 and finds the applicant's argument unpersuasive.

Claim 12 is directed to an isolated polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:1. The specification describes SEQ ID NO:1 as genomic DNA encoding chicken collagen II (page 26 and 10). Upholt et al. teach genomic DNA chicken α 1 (II) procollagen gene.

Claim 13 is directed to an isolated polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:2. The specification describes SEQ ID NO:2 as chicken collagen II cDNA. Upholt et al. describe sequencing of the mRNA encoding regions of chicken collagen α 1 (II) (page 2325). Inherently, the cDNA sequence is known.

Claims 14-19 are directed to vectors and cells comprising the chicken collagen II genes of claims 12-13, recombinant proteins generated therefrom, method of producing recombinant chicken collagen II, compositions of recombinant chicken collagen II, food additives comprising recombinant chicken collagen II.

Matsumoto et al. teach, "oral drugs and functional foods [which] contain type-II collagen" (abstract). Matsumoto et al. teach that the type II collagen can be chicken collagen (col.3, line 40). Matsumoto et al. teach that the type-II collagen can be made

using “recombinant DNA technology” (col.3, lines 46-47). Intrinsically, to use recombinant DNA technology for producing type-II chicken collagen, a skilled artisan would need to have cells comprising vectors comprising isolated nucleic acids encoding chicken collagen II. To the extent to which the pharmaceutical composition comprising CCII might have an enabled use (e.g. – a food additive), Matsumoto et al. teach the limitations of claims 14-19.

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the sequences of Upholt et al. to express recombinant forms of chicken collagen II for use in the pharmaceutical compositions of Matsumoto et al.

Regarding the rationale for simple substitution of one known, equivalent element for another to obtain predictable results, the claim(s) would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Each of the elements (specific chicken collagen II sequences and methods of recombinant protein production of chicken collagen II and uses therefor) is taught by Upholt et al. or Matsumoto et al. It would be therefore predictably obvious to substitute a known element (chicken collagen II nucleic acid) in recombinant production of chicken collagen II for food additives.

Therefore the products and methods as taught by Upholt et al. in view of Matsumoto et al. would have been *prima facie* obvious over the products and methods of the instant application.

Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of the instant claims for the reasons of record and the comments above.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upholt et al. (PNAS. April 1986; Vol.83: 2325-2329) in view of Xi et al. (accession number AAK98621, direct submission on 19 July 2001).

Claim 21 is directed to an isolated polynucleotide coding for the protein SEQ ID NO:3. The sequence submitted by Xi et al. in 2001 is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:3. Upholt et al. teach genomic DNA chicken α 1 (II) procollagen gene. Upholt et al. describe sequencing of the mRNA encoding regions of chicken collagen α 1 (II) (page 2325).

While the protein sequence of SEQ ID NO:3 is not disclosed by Upholt et al., the nucleic acids disclosed by Upholt et al. taken with the polypeptide sequence of Xi et al. are obvious over the instant claim.

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the sequences of Upholt et al. and Xi et al. to describe a isolated polynucleotide which encodes the DNA chicken α 1 (II) procollagen protein SEQ ID NO:3.

As skilled artisan would certainly have success deriving a the nucleotide sequence for a polynucleotide which encodes the DNA chicken α 1 (II) procollagen protein SEQ ID NO:3.

Therefore, the products as taught by Upholt et al. in view of Xi et al. would have been *prima facie* obvious over the products of the instant application.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Examiner Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Long** whose telephone number is **571-272-9048**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SDL/ Scott Long
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1633

/Janet L. Epps-Ford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633